

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2023

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/23/3317897

18 Grove Road, Fareham, PO16 7TE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Beale against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/22/1656/FP, dated 15 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of new roof, reinstatement of chimney, second floor rear extension with parapet roof, 2No. 'Velux' style roof lights to front roof slope and side window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey bay fronted detached home of traditional design. It lies within a stretch of dwellings on the west side of Grove Road which are broadly similar in character. The immediate area is of an established residential nature and with a pleasing understated appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The key element of the scheme would be, effectively, changing the rear elevation of the appeal property from two storeys to three across the full width of the home. To achieve this extension, both flank walls and the rear wall would be increased, excessively, in the same plane vertically. The rear pitched roof would be all, bar a very small ridge strip, removed to be replaced by this additional walling with its parapet and flat roof finish and main rear facing windows. Regrettably in the context of the existing property and a generally two storey pitched roof environment the appeal scheme would make this dwelling seem overly cumbersome and bulky. The extension works would bear very little relationship to the pleasant proportions of walls, roof and design generally of the current home; certainly, would not appear subservient in any way; and would make this home markedly out of place and awkward.
-

5. The proposed development would be incongruous and I simply cannot agree with the Appellant that this would represent good quality design or be architecturally appropriate. Although visibility from the public realm would be limited numerous private views would be available and in any event lack of direct impact on a streetscene is not a reason for condoning poor design.
6. Policy D1 of the Fareham Local Plan 2037 (adopted 5 April 2023) is relevant. Amongst other matters, this policy seeks to secure development with high design quality drawing suitably upon context, existing built form, and the general character of a building and locality. In all the circumstances I conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with this planning policy.

Other matters

7. I do understand the Appellant's wish to improve internal space. I can see that extensive dialogue has taken place with the Council to seek to reach an outcome satisfactory to both sides and this is a commendable attempt albeit deadlock was reached. I entirely appreciate that this appeal scheme is put forward by the Appellant seeing it as an enhanced extension solution relative to the approved, later designed, large scale box dormer (ref P/22/1822/FP). However, I simply do not agree with this. To my mind the box dormer pushes top level expansion on this family home to the limit but at least it does have some degree of subtlety achieved through parts of roof slope that would be evident, not having such extents of unrelieved vertical walling, and the planned use of tile hanging.
8. I note the Appellant's arguments including, amongst other matters, structural efficiency and continuity of materials as well as optimised internal space roof protection and scope for installation of solar panels but I am not at all persuaded that the points put individually or collectively outweigh the aesthetic demerits I have identified.
9. I have reviewed buildings with parapets and other arrangements drawn to my attention but found none to be directly comparable in terms of host property, location or form. They would not create any sort of precedent to my mind and in any event, I have to assess the current proposal on its own merits.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
11. I confirm that the National Planning Policy Framework has been considered; the Council's policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond
INSPECTOR